

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-7, 14-18, and 24-40 of this application is respectfully requested. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 14-18, 24-34 and 37-40 are in this application. Claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 14-15, 24-34 and 37-40 have been amended. Claims -- have been amended as suggested by the Patent Office and as discussed below in connection with the claim objections and 112 rejections. Claims \_\_ have been amended for clarity to recite a "cured liquid rubberized coating material." Support for this amendment is found in the specification at \_\_ and in original claims \_\_ and \_\_. Claims \_\_ have been amended for clarity to recite \_\_\_\_\_. Support for these amendments is found in the specification at \_\_ and in original claims \_\_\_\_\_. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**The Claim Objections****The Objection to Claims 29-36**

Claims 29-36 are objected to as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the objection to these claims. Claims 29 and 31-34 have been amended for clarity to positively recite the elements of a combination of a building structure and a building construction material. Claim 30 has been amended for clarity to positively recite a building construction material. It is believed that the amendments overcome the objection.

**The Objection to Claims 24, 37 and 40**

Claims 24, 37 and 40 have been amended for clarity as suggested by the Patent Office. It is believed that the amendments overcome the objection.

**The § 112 Rejections****The Rejection of Claims 35 and 36**

Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

Claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering this rejection moot.

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

**§ 102 Rejections****Rejection of Claims 1, 4-6, 24, 25, 27-31, and 35-40 under 102(b) as being anticipated by Nemeth**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1, 4-6, 24, 25, 27-31, and 35-40 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nemeth, United States Patent Number 4,242,390.

The Patent Office has stated in its paragraph 12, *Response to Arguments*, on page 9 of the Final Office Action, that the term "liquid plastic coating material" reads on the "liquid rubberized coating material" recited in independent claims 1, 24 and 28, as amended. Applicant respectfully points out that the phrase "liquid plastic coating material" does not appear anywhere in Nemeth. Neither does the word "rubber" or the term "liquid rubberized coating material" appear anywhere in Nemeth. Nemeth does make reference to a "plastics material" for forming a moisture barrier (see Nemeth, Col 2, lines 58-59). The term "plastic" is used to refer generally to a material that is malleable and moldable and deforms when heated. "Plastic" may also be used to generically refer to specific types of synthetic materials that fall into the major categories of thermoplastics, thermosetting plastics, and elastomeric plastics. For example, polypropylene is a plastic that falls in the category of thermoplastics. Use of the generic term "plastic" to describe a bottle made with polypropylene is comparable to use of the generic term "metal" to describe a copper pan.

Rubber is a specific type of material that is classified as an elastomer. Rubber is not a plastic. Materials made with rubber sometimes share certain physical characteristics with elastomeric plastics. Despite the possibility that rubber materials may sometimes share properties which are similar to materials grouped within the generic term "plastic," "plastic" is not "rubber." Further, "plastic" is not understood to mean any specific type of plastic, nor is it understood to mean each and every type of plastic. Accordingly, the "plastics material" referenced in Nemeth does not read on and does not anticipate the "cured liquid rubberized coating material" recited in claims 1, 24 and 28, and their dependent claims, as amended, nor does it read on the "elastomeric membrane comprising rubber" recited in claim 37, and its dependent claims, as amended.

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

Applicant respectfully submits that Nemeth does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood subfloor, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Nemeth does not disclose a flooring system having a concrete slab, a wood subfloor comprising a rubberized coating, or a finished wood floor, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Nemeth does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board, as recited in amended independent claims 24 and 28. And Nemeth does not disclose an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber which is coated on to a wood board, as recited in amended independent claim 37. The Nemeth disclosure provides a moisture barrier coated on a layered tile, the coating consisting of one or a mixture of the following: a water-repellent wax such as ozocerite wax; a plastic in the form of a thermoplastic material such as ethylene vinyl acetate copolymer; a dried varnish such as vinyl chloride, vinyl acetate copolymer; or a plastic in the form of a thermosetting resin such as polyurethane. (See Nemeth, Col 4, lines 22- 34.) The plastic coatings and barriers of Nemeth are not the same as the coatings and moisture barriers recited in the instant claims and have different physical properties. Nowhere does Nemeth mention rubber, much less disclose a cured liquid rubberized coating material. Nowhere does Nemeth mention a board, much less a board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating. Nowhere does Nemeth mention an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber, in particular an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber coated onto a wood board. Lacking such disclosure, Nemeth does not anticipate amended claims 1, 24, 28 and 37, or their dependent claims, 4-6, 25, 27, 29-31, and 38-40, as amended. Dependent claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Nemeth also lacks disclosure of other structures and features that are recited in the instant claims. For example: dependent claims 29, 31-34, and 40, as amended, recite a building structure comprising a wood board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating; dependent claims 30, 38 and 39, as amended, recite a moisture barrier comprising a board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating comprising an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber; claim 38 also recites a wood board of elongated cubical shape coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating; claim also 40 recites a building structure which comprises a floor wherein the floor comprises the building construction material as defined in claim 28. Nemeth does not disclose any of these structures or features. Lacking such disclosure, Nemeth does not anticipate claims

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

1, 4-6, 24, 25, 27-31, and 35-40, as amended. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37 and 40 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Padmanabhan '942

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 24, 25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37 and 40 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Padmanabhan, United States Patent Number 6,179,942.

The Patent Office has stated on page 9 of the Final Office Action that the term "liquid plastic coating material" reads on the "liquid rubberized coating material" recited in claims 1, 14, 24 and 28. Applicant respectfully points out that the phrase "liquid plastic coating material" does not appear anywhere in Padmanabhan. Likewise, the word "rubber" and the term "liquid rubberized coating material" do not appear anywhere in Padmanabhan. The Final Office Action seems to suggest that the term "plastic" as used in Padmanabhan encompasses "liquid rubberized coating material." As discussed above in connection with Nemeth, use of the term "plastic" does not constitute a disclosure or suggestion of the rubber materials recited by Applicant. Accordingly, the various references to "plastic" in Padmanabhan do not read on or anticipate the "cured liquid rubberized coating material" recited in amended claims 24 and 28, or their dependent claims, as amended, nor do they read on or anticipate the "elastomeric membrane comprising rubber" recited in amended claim 37, or its dependent claims, as amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that Padmanabhan does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board, as recited in amended independent claims 24 and 28. Also Padmanabhan does not disclose an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber which is coated on to a wood board, as recited in amended independent claim 37. Padmanabhan discloses a layered composite wood board that is laminated on the topside and has attached on its underside a layer of fiber reinforced plastic (FRP) consisting of glass, carbon or aramid fibers set in a matrix such as an epoxy resin, vinyl ester, phenolic resin, polyester, polypropylene and polyamide (Padmanabhan, Col 10, lines 28-29, Col 11, lines 5-6, and 12-14). Nowhere does Padmanabhan mention rubber, much less disclose a cured liquid rubberized coating material. Nowhere does Padmanabhan mention a

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

board coated with a moisture and condensation barrier, much less a board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating. The moisture barrier of Padmanabhan is a rigid and thin panel or sheet of FRP that is attached to the underside of a board. It is not coated on to the board, but instead attached by use of a glue or bonding agent applied to the board and the FRP. (See Padmanabhan, for example, Col 11, lines 25-33, and 46-54, Col 12, lines 32-38.) Nowhere does Padmanabhan mention an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber, in particular an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber coated onto a wood board. Lacking such disclosure, Padmanabhan does not anticipate amended claims 24, 28 and 37, or their dependent claims 25, 27, 29, 31-33 and 40, as amended. Dependent claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Padmanabhan also lacks disclosure of other structures and features that are recited in the instant claims. For example: dependent claims 29, 31-33, and 40, as amended, recite a building structure comprising a wood board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating; claim also 40 recites a building structure which comprises a floor wherein the floor comprises the building construction material as defined in claim 28. Padmanabhan does not disclose any of these structures or features. Lacking such disclosure, Padmanabhan does not anticipate claims 24, 25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37 and 40, as amended. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 36 and 37-40 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Radcliffe

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 36 and 37-40 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Radcliffe, United States Patent Number 6,136,408.

Applicant respectfully submits that Radcliffe does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board, as recited in amended independent claims 24 and 28. And Radcliffe does not disclose an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber which is coated on to a wood board, as recited in amended independent claim 37. Radcliffe discloses a construction material of layered wood strands, having a surface of polyurethane which is smooth, has a high gloss, and which is

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

resistant to water penetration, and is produced by surface treatment of the wood with methylene diphenyl diisocyanate or polymeric methylene diphenyl diisocyanate and polyols. (Radcliffe, Col 2, lines 55-67, Col 3, lines 1-11.) Nowhere does Radcliffe disclose a cured liquid rubberized coating material. Radcliffe does not mention rubber. The coatings of Radcliffe are thin thermosetting plastics that are chemically different from rubberized coating materials and have very different physical properties when cured. Nowhere does Radcliffe mention an elastomeric membrane comprising a rubberized material. Lacking such disclosure, Radcliffe does not anticipate amended claims 24, 28 and 37, or their dependent claims 25, 27, 30 and 38-40, as amended. Dependent claim 36 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of this claim.

Radcliffe also lacks disclosure of other structures and features that are recited in the instant claims. For example: dependent claims 30, 38 and 39, as amended, recite a moisture barrier comprising a board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating which is an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber; claim 40 also recites a building structure which comprises a floor wherein the floor comprises the building construction material as defined in claim 28. Lacking such disclosure, Radcliffe does not anticipate claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 36 and 37-40, as amended. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1,4-7, 14-15, 24-25, 27-31, and 35-40 under 102(e) as being anticipated by German Patent No. 195,20,567

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1,4-7, 14-15, 24-25, 27-31, and 35-40 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by German Patent No. 195,20,567 ("Genshow").

Applicant respectfully submits that Genshow does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood subfloor, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Likewise, Genshow does not disclose a flooring system having a concrete slab, a wood subfloor comprising a rubberized coating, or a finished wood floor, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Genshow does not disclose a method of forming a floor system supported by a concrete slab by coating a plurality of boards with a liquid rubberized coating material and placing the coated boards to create a wood

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

subfloor, as recited in independent claim 14. Genshow does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board, as recited in amended independent claims 24 and 28. And Genshow does not disclose an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber which is coated on to a wood board, as recited in amended independent claim 37. Genshow discloses coated tiles and plates made of ceramics and other hard fibers and minerals. The tiles and grout spaces between the tiles are coated with clear thermosetting epoxide and polyurethane resins. (See Genshow, attached translated publication, page 3, lines 1-9) The plastic coatings and barriers of Genshow are not the same as the coatings and moisture barriers recited in the instant claims and have different physical properties. Nowhere does Genshow mention rubber, nor disclose a cured liquid rubberized coating material. Nowhere does Genshow mention a wood board, or a wood board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating. Nowhere does Genshow mention a flooring system or method for forming a flooring system which comprises a wood subfloor comprising wood boards coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating. And nowhere does Genshow mention an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber, in particular an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber coated onto a wood board. Lacking such disclosure, Genshow does not anticipate amended claims 1, 14, 24, 28 and 37, or their dependent claims, 4-7, 15, 25, 27, 29-31, and 38-40, as amended. Dependent claims 35 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Genshow also lacks disclosure of other structures and features that are recited in the instant claims. For example: dependent claims 29, 31, and 40, as amended, recite a building structure comprising a wood board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating; dependent claims 30, 38 and 39, as amended, recite a moisture barrier comprising a wood board coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating comprising an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber; claim 38 also recites a wood board of elongated cubical shape coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating; claim also 40 recites a building structure which comprises a floor wherein the floor comprises the building construction material as defined in claim 28. Genshow does not disclose any of these structures or features. Lacking such disclosure, Genshow does not anticipate claims 1, 4-7, 14-15, 24, 25, 27-31, and 35-40, as amended. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.



## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

Rejection of Claims 24, 25 and 27 under 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 7-268970

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 24, 25 and 27 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 7-268970.

Applicant respectfully submits that JP 7-268970 does not disclose a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board, as recited in amended independent claim 24. JP 7-268970 discloses a moisture preventing coating layer for use on building members consisting of an amino alkyd resin (JP 7-268970, Abstract, Constitution.). The coating of JP 7-268970 is a thin thermosetting plastic that is chemically different from rubberized coating materials and has very different physical properties when cured. Nowhere does JP 7-268970 mention rubber, much less disclose a cured liquid rubberized coating material. Lacking such disclosure, JP 7-268970 does not anticipate amended claims 24, 25 and 27. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

§ 103 RejectionsRejection of Claims 1-7, 14-18, and 24-40 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauran '651 in view of Abendroth '936 and Nemeth '390

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1-7, 14-18, and 24-40 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauran '651 in view of Abendroth '936 and Nemeth '390.

As discussed above, amended independent claim 1 recites a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood subfloor. Amended independent claim 1 also recites a flooring system having a concrete slab, a wood subfloor comprising a rubberized coating, and a finished wood floor. Independent claim 14 recites a method of forming a floor system supported by a concrete slab by coating a plurality of boards with a liquid rubberized coating material and placing the coated boards to create a wood subfloor. Amended independent claims 24 and 28 recite a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board. And amended

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

independent claim 37 recites an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber which is coated on to a wood board.

As described in Mauran, a chamber for the manufacture of bleaching powders is provided. The objective of Mauran is to provide an improved chamber in which the floor of the chamber can be conveniently and economically cooled during the high-temperature process of powder making, while maintaining a water and vapor-tight seal within the chamber floor. (Mauran, Col 1, lines 26-50, Col 2, lines 55-66). To achieve this improved chamber floor, Mauran discloses four layers. The top layer is a floor of closely spaced, chemically resistant, thermally conducting, ceramic tile. The second layer is a thin bed of asphalt to provide gas and moisture proofing. The third layer is a monolithic slab of cement. And the bottom layer is a sheet of insulating paper to shield against heat transfer from the chamber to the work surface. Conspicuously, Mauran does not disclose a wood subfloor as recited in amended claim 1. Mauran does not even mention wood or any wood members such as boards, also as recited in each of the instant independent claims. Mauran does not disclose any coatings, and in particular, Mauran does not disclose any coatings made with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in amended claims 1, 14, 24 and 28. Neither does Mauran disclose an elastomeric coating comprising rubber as recited in amended independent claim 37. Mauran does not even mention rubber.

Abendroth does not provide what Mauran lacks. Much like Mauran, Abendroth provides a multi layered flooring system. In contrast to the Mauran system, which uses tile for structure and asphalt for moisture protection, the Abendroth system uses wood boards for structure and a plastic sheet for moisture protection. The Abendroth system comprises floor boards that form the floor surface and are layered on top of laminated members to permit breathability under the floor surface. The laminated members are layered on top of a rigid material layer for stability and which is layered on top of a resilient layer of polyethylene foam for flexibility and shock absorption. Beneath the resilient layer is vapor barrier layer which is a layer of 6 mil polyethylene sheeting. (See Abendroth, Columns 3 and 4.)

As with the system of Mauran, the Abendroth system rests on a concrete slab bottom layer. As with Mauran, Abendroth does not disclose any coatings on anything, much less

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

coatings on wood boards made with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in amended claims 1, 14, 24 and 28. And as with Mauran, Abendroth does not disclose an elastomeric coating comprising rubber as recited in amended independent claim 37. Abendroth does not mention rubber either. Accordingly, if the flooring system of Mauran were modified by combination with one or more of the various layers of Abendroth, the resulting combination would lack the distinct feature of boards coated with liquid rubberized coating materials as recited in Applicant's claims 1-7, 14-18, 24-34 and 40. Such a combination would also lack an elastomeric membrane comprising rubber, as recited in claims 30, and 37-39.

The Patent Office has suggested that further modification and adaptation of the Mauran/Abendroth combination using the teachings of Nemeth would effectively render obvious the inventions of claims 1-7, 14-18, and 24-40. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the Nemeth disclosure provides an improved design for a layered tile that can be used over a concrete slab to form a floor. The tiles are made of two main layers, a floor surface forming layer and a carrier layer. The floor surface forming layer has a decorative layer and may also have on its surface a wear resistant layer. The carrier layer may also include a moisture barrier or seal means that is remote from the floor surface forming layer (Nemeth, col 2, lines 14-39 and 56-60, claims 12 and 19). Both the moisture barrier and the wear resistant layers consist of one or a mixture of various specific thermoplastic and thermosetting plastic materials (Nemeth, col. 4, lines 22-34). The moisture barrier layer is applied to a thickness of 0.01 mm to 0.1 mm (col 4, line 34, claim 19). The wear resistant layer is applied to a thickness of 0.1 to 2.5 mm (col 2, lines 67-68, claim 23).

Even assuming one of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to further combine the cited references as suggested by the Patent Office, Nemeth does not provide what the Mauran/Abendroth combination lacks. Nemeth does not disclose a coating made with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in amended claims 1, 14, 24 and 28. Nemeth does not disclose an elastomeric coating comprising rubber as recited in amended independent claim 37. Nemeth does not even mention rubber. A combination of Mauran/Abendroth with Nemeth would thus still not provide the flooring systems of independent claims 1 and 14, or the construction materials of claims 24 and 28, or the building structures of dependent claims 29, 31-34, and 40. While such a combination would provide a flooring system with a concrete slab, and

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

a board coated with one of the plastics of Nemeth, it would still be not be the same as the flooring systems recited in claims 1 and 14. Nor would the construction materials be the same as those recited in each of the instant claims. In short, it could not be obvious for one of skill in the art to combine the cited references to provide the inventions of Applicant, because such a combination would not in fact provide any of the inventions claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the claims 1-7, 14-18, and 24-40 are not unpatentable over Mauran in view of Abendroth and Nemeth. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 24 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nemeth, or JP7-268970, or Padmanabhan in view of Abendroth '936.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 1 and 24 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nemeth, or JP7-268970, or Padmanabhan in view of Abendroth '936.

The Nemeth, JP 7-268970 and Padmanabhan disclosures are discussed above. As discussed above, neither Nemeth, nor JP 7-268970, nor Padmanabhan teaches or suggests a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood subfloor as recited in amended claim 1. Likewise, none of these references teaches or suggests a moisture and condensation barrier comprising a cured liquid rubberized coating material coated onto a wood board as recited in amended claim 24. None of these references teaches or suggests a wood subfloor. Nemeth specifically does not teach or suggest a wood board. Also, the vapor barrier plastic panels taught by Padmanabhan are not coated on to the laminated boards disclosed in that reference.

The Patent Office suggests that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine one of the references of Nemeth, or JP 7-268970 or Padmanabhan with Abendroth, and that such combination would provide the inventions recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 24. Abendroth provides a multi layered flooring system built on a concrete slab foundation. The system uses wood boards and various rigid and flexible members for structure and a plastic sheet to protect these structural members from vapor and moisture penetration through the concrete slab. As discussed in Abendroth, the sheeting layer is draped over the concrete slab foundation

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

and is preferably not secured to the foundation or any other part of the flooring system. (Abendroth, col 4, lines 13-15.)

Applicant respectfully argues that one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to combine any one of the Nemeth, JP 7-268970, or Padmanabhan references with Abendroth. Each of those primary references provides an attached moisture barrier. The Nemeth and JP 7-268970 barriers are plastics coated on to the desired surfaces of the substrates. The Padmanabhan vapor panel is glued or bonded to the wood substrate. The close attachment of the moisture barriers in each of these references is central to the design of the disclosed systems. In contrast, Abendroth states that it is preferable that the vapor barrier is not attached. Given the opposing approaches of the Nemeth, JP 7-268970 and Padmanabhan references on the one hand, and Abendroth on the other hand, Applicant submits that none of these references would suggest or motivate substitution of the disclosed moisture barriers of either Nemeth, or JP 7-268970 or Padmanabhan, with a barrier that is not attached to the surface to be protected from moisture, such as that disclosed in Abendroth.

Even assuming one of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to further combine the references as suggested by the Patent Office, Abendroth does not provide what each of the primary cited references lacks. Abendroth does not disclose any coatings on anything, much less coatings on wood boards made with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in amended claims 1 and 24. Abendroth does not mention rubber. Accordingly, even if the floor tiles over a concrete slab, as described by Nemeth, were modified by combination with the vapor barrier or any of the other flooring layers of Abendroth, the resulting combination would lack the distinct feature of boards coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 24. Similarly, if the amino alkyd resin coated building members of JP 7-268970 were combined with the vapor barrier or any of the other flooring layers of Abendroth, the resulting combination would also lack the distinct feature of boards coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 24. And finally, combination of the laminated wood board of Padmanabhan with the vapor barrier or any of the other flooring layers of Abendroth would as well lack the distinct feature of boards coated with a cured liquid rubberized coating material as recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 24. For the foregoing reasons, it could not be obvious for one of skill in the art to combine the cited

## Proposed Amendment of April 22, 2003

references to provide the inventions of Applicant, because such combinations, even if made, would not in fact provide any of the inventions claimed by Applicant in claims 1 and 24. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the claims 1 and 24 are not unpatentable over Nemeth, or JP 7-268970 or Padmanabhan in view of Abendroth. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendment to this application and the remarks made above, reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that his application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane H. Dobrea, Reg. No. 48,578  
(216) 622-8485  
Customer Number 24024